Previous references.

1906.

(Courts)

File No. 140/05-

Serial Nos. 167.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 167

Part B. for April 1906.

SUBJECT.

Prayers of certain retired Amildars for permission to enroll themselves as Advocates or of first Grade Pleaders.

FILE No. 140 of 1905-06.

Revision of rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders.

From M. R. Ry. R. Lutchman Rao and another, retired Amildars, Mysore, dated the 2nd November 1905.

Requests that the rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders may be amended so as to admit of two classes of Advocates as in the case of Pleaders to enable retired Amildars like themselves to take advantage of the same and if this is not feasible they may be permitted to be enrolled as first grade Pleaders.

To the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore, No. J. 1399, dated the 20th November 1905.

Forwards the above petition and requests him to favor Government with the views of the Chief Court on the prayer of the petitioners and as to whether any modification of the rules is required in the interests of retired officers as Magistrates, Munsiffs, etc.

From the Deputy Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore, No. 4722—180, dated the 21st December 1905.

States that the standard for Advocates should not be lower than what has already been laid down; that clause (*e*) of Rule (1) of the Rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders, needs no alteration; that it is extremely difficult to lay down any general rule beyond those already prescribed as regards the qualification required for the admission of retired officers as 1st and 2nd grade Pleaders, but that the Judges consider it better that a separate application showing the character, qualifications and services of each officer desiring to be enrolled as a Pleader should be made in each case and proposes certain amendments in the existing rules accordingly.

G. R.

4	To the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore, No. J. 1908—Cts. 140-4, dated the 10th January 1906. Requests the Chief Court to consider as to how far 1st Class Magistrates can be deemed eligible for admission as Advocates.
5	From the same officer, No. 5526—214, dated the 8th February 1906. States that the Chief Court considers that the experience of retired 1st Class Magistrates especially qualifies them to act as Advocates in Criminal cases; that, unless they make themselves efficient in the conduct of Civil cases also, it is not likely that litigants will employ them in that class of cases; and that there is no reason, therefore, to restrain them from such employment by any special order.
6	To the Registrar, Chief Court, No. J. 2724, dated the 4th April 1906. States that the rules now in force *re* the enrolment of Advocates and Pleaders should remain as they are and cannot be changed so as to render the retired Amildars eligible for enrolment.
7	To Mr. R. Lutchman Rao and another, retired Amildars, Mysore, No. J. 2725, dated the 4th April 1906. States that their request cannot be complied with.

G. R. S. 11] 1905.06.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Courts.)

NOTES.

File No. 140

FILE HEADING.

~~Debitors~~ Revision of rules relating to Advocates & pleaders.

From

M.R.Ry. A. Lutchuman & another, Retired Amildars, Hgore

No. - Dated 2/11/05 Received 4/11/05

Diary No. 1048	Enclos. -	Spare Copies. -	Serial No. 461

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Requests that the rules re Advocates & Pleaders may be amended so as to admit of 2 classes of Advocates as in the case of pleaders & enable retired Amildars like themselves to take advantage of the same & if this is not feasible they may be allowed to become 1st Grade pleaders.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1 It is stated by the petitioners that the Chingleput refused them so for back as 1895 to enrol them as Advocates. They now pray for an amendment of the existing rules.

2 May they be informed that Govt. are not prepared to amend the existing rules as desired & that

Notes—First sheet.

MGCPB—30,000—17-2-05.

Serial No.

As regards their being allowed to practise as Pleaders they may make a representation to the Chief Ct.

3 Submitted with a draft for approval and for other orders.

JKS 9/11/05 9-11-05

Secy 9-11-05

4 Submitted to the Hon'ble Sahib Dewan the 7th Councillor, for orders, this being an application from some Amildars for treatment like Moonsiffs

10/11/1905

707 10-11-1905

5th This appears to be a remedy to an appeal said to have been preferred some years ago. But no such appeal appears to be forthcoming.

6 The admission of any Advocate with less than (10+2) is out of the question.

7 As regards the alternative request, there seems no use in referring the Petitioners to the Chief Court. They are not qualified under existing rules & therefore their request cannot be granted. Most officers of

MGCPB—50,000—17-2-05

Serial No.

1st Class Magistrates of same standing are ~~entitled to be~~ qualified for admission as Advocates under clause (c) of Rule I of the Rules published with the Notification of 9th March 1893. The Petitioners ask that Assistants of same standing be determined qualified for admission as Advocates by the insertion of a corresponding clause under the next following Rule. This request may I think be referred to the Chief Court for opinion. I am afraid that none of our retired officers has so far been much of a success as legal practitioners. Regard however has to the special consideration shown to our Municipal 1st Class Magistrates ~~generally~~, I am not prepared to say that the present application is altogether unreasonable. Let us however obtain an expression of the Chief Court's views before passing order.

11-11-05.

(⊗) See orders after clause (c) of Rule II. K

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905

Serial No.

8 Municipalities ~~are~~ ~~required to~~ rather than by themselves & how they will judge I do not see any difficulty in recognising them perhaps to become Advocates - But 1st class Mofs are different. I do not know how they can be ~~made~~ deemed eligible. The rule as the point requires consideration - The relation of Attendants also may be considered by the Chief Court. What I suggest is that the whole subject may be considered now.

(Illegible) 12.XI.05

9 Draft-ready

10 3.11.1905

Draft-Ld

14/11/05 15-11-05

Dr Dr 14/11/05

11 Passed 16.11.1905

12 To the Registrar of the Chief Ct. No. 91355 & 20/11/05.

Forwards the petitions & requests that the Govt. may be favoured with the opinion

NOTE.—Contd. sheet.

MGCPB—50,000—17-2-05

Serial No.

of the Chief Ct on the grant of the petitioners ~~on the subject of the admission~~ & whether any modification of the rules is required in the interests of retired officers.

From the Dy Registrar of the Chief Ct of Lyons No. 4722/180 of the 14th December 1905:

States that the ~~Court considers~~ Chief Ct considers that the standard for advocates should not be lowered; that no alteration is therefore called for in the rule allowing certain kind of retired officers also as advocates; that it is extremely difficult to lay down any further rule beyond those already prescribed as regards ~~the qualifications required of~~ the admission of retired officers as 1st & 2nd grade pleaders but that it would be better that a separate application showing the character qualifications & services of each retired officer desiring to be enrolled as a pleader should be made in each case & proposes amendments to the existing rules accordingly.

12 The information was directed to be obtained both by the 1st Comm'r & the Dy Commr & submitted

28/12/05 13/ Subd to the Secretary 28.12.05

28/12/05 Submitted to the Dy Commr for orders thereon the 1st Commr for orders

28/12/1905

1047 28.12.1905

NOTE.—Count sheet.

Serial No.

15. The Diwan entertained doubts as to the propriety of the present rule entitling 1st Class Magistrates to be enrolled as Advocates in the same way as Munsifs. He wanted this question as well as the question of qualifications generally, to be considered as a whole. This was not however clearly put before the Chief Court. That Court therefore thinks that a lower qualification than that of a 1st Class Magistrate should not be deemed sufficient. However that may be, they are not in favor of altering the present rules so far as Advocates are concerned.

16 As regards 1st & 2nd Grade Pleaders, the Court propose to reserve to themselves a power by the insertion of a general clause under Rule II(c) & Rule III(c). This if

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905/1906

Serial No.

Sanctioned moved opens a door for ~~the acceptance~~ applications from a large no of non-receipt retired officers ~~to whom away to their offices~~ ~~to whom to such posts~~ Hon'ble ~~is~~ practically involving a reversion to the ~~post~~ state of things that existed before the introduction of the Executive & Headers' Rules = Moreover a General rule of this kind would not be a sufficient compliance with Section 10 of the Regulation - A new Rule must state that Section should be observed "the qualifications" and not leave the same to be determined in each case on its merits - On the whole it appears to me undesirable to make any alteration in the Present Rules - The Memorialists may be informed that their ~~last~~ request cannot be complied with - [illegible]

29/12/05 -

29.12.05

29/12/05

10549
30.12.05

17 [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

and say whether the Commissioner's Court is in accordance with my note of 12. XI. 05. I am sorry that the Chief Court did not understand previously with respect what proposals with the least expected have been received — The drafts must be prepared with great care — This matter may perhaps be placed before Council.

(Illegible)
31. XII. 05

It is respectfully submitted that to the humble thinking of the Dy: Secy & myself the reference made to the Chief Court (appeared to be in accordance with the orders passed. The present Rules provide for the admission of Mooktiars & persons who have served 1st class Magistrates powers for 5 years as advocates the Khan Saheb while admitting the reasonableness of enrolling the Mooktiars as advocates desired to the propriety of extending the concession

Serial No.

& first class Magts. also, & directed that the whole of the rules might be reconsidered by the chief court while considering the present application of the retired amildars for admission either as advocates or as pleaders. The Diwan Saheb's decision as to 1st class Magts. was taken as an opinion & proposal for consideration while disposing of the question on receipt of the reply of the Chief Court & so it was not communicated to them, but their opinion on the whole of the rules being revised while disposing of the retired Amildars prayer, was invited. We beg to know if the ~~opinion of the chief court~~ the propriety of about 1st class Magts being also enrolled as advocates may now be invited.

4.1.1906
Secy.

10633
5.1.06

4.1.06
Dy Secy

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 190

Serial No.

10696

19. Yes - Inquire should have the opinion of the Govt. on the remarks above made.

Mudd 6.1.06

20 Draft accepted 8.1.1906.

21 Draft reproducing the above Note of 12-11-05 as regards 1st cl. Magts. & subs. for approval.

Lee 8/1/06

22 Passed 8.1.1906.

23 Please put up a clean copy as revised by the Legal Adviser, after issue. 8-1-06

4 To the Regr. of the Ch. Court No. 1508/ Ch. 140-4 & 10/1/06.

Requests the Chief Ct. to consider as to how far 1st class magistrates can be deemed eligible for admission as advocates.

5 From the same office No. 5516/114 & Mg. dd. Feb 06.

States that the Chief Court considers that the experience of retired first class magistrates specially qualifies them to act as Advocates

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-04.

Serial No.

in criminal cases; that unless they make themselves efficient in the conduct of civil cases also, it is not likely that litigants will employ them in that class of cases; and that there is no reason, therefore, to restrain them from such employment by any special order.

24. Subj. The Diwan called for their views from others. The amendments proposed by the Chief Court have not to be considered.

22/2/06

22/2/06

Let

22-2-06

22/2/06 25. Submitted to the Devanshebe thus the Committee

1409 / 23.2.1906

&

by 23.2.1906.

26. The present Rules may be left as they are. I have already given my opinion, vide my note of 29/12/05.

C.

11490 / 24.2.06

24.2.1906

11491

24-2-06.

27. Bring all papers before me.

25.2.06

27.2.1906

28. Draft a letter to the Registrar of the Chief Court

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12j
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905 VI

Serial No.

that, after giving the matter their best consideration, the Govt are of opinion that the Rules may remain as they are at present, & that no alteration need be made therein.

29. Draft also an Endt to the petrs stating that their request cannot be complied with.

Drafts ordd

27.2.06

RO 2/3/06 — Lee

2/3/06

30. Draft prepared as per orders passed is submitted to the Dewan Saheb thro the Sr. Councillor. It refuses the prayer of the retired Amildars for permission to practise as pleaders & the Chief Court have considered their request & recommend slight alterations of the rules on the subject — & enable them to enroll pensioned Offrs of character & qualifications as 1st & 2nd Grade pleaders. The Govt disagree with the

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPC—50,000—28-10-05

G.R.S. 12j
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905/1906

Serial No.

Chief Court — the matter has been submitted to His Highness as per order passed on file No 48 of 1905/1906 a copy of which is hereto attached. In these circumstances I beg to know if the order drafts may issue. — HK

5.3.1906

(Ex Diary N.)

1502
7-3-06.

31 The Despatch is in any opinion all right. As the other question raised by the Secretariat, the Nawab's orders may be obtained. — BL.

8/3/06.

11748
9.3.06
Nawab 8/3/06

8.3.1906 11771

32 Comment on II Counter and send a reasoned letter from the Spl Judge Chief Court and the rule may be amended accordingly — Urdu

10.3.06

109
12-3-06

To 2 Committee

12.3.1906

G.P.S.—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905/1906

Serial No. 33

It is well known
fact that some of our
Candidates who have
been retired on super-
annuation pension have
still much energy left
in them, and having
been accustomed to
a busy life during
long years of public office
cannot find time hang-
ing on them for want
of occupation on their
retirement. It is well
that may find some
other kind of life apart
from their own experience
much difficulty to make
both ends meet with
their limited income
It is hence my fact
they should be given
every facility to find
some honorable work
and thus supplement
their ~~pension~~ income
& honest livelihood. In

Note—Contn. sheet

MGCPB—50,000—24-7-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905-06

Serial No.

Also main the recommendation of the Chief Court deserves favourable consideration. As the rules at present stand provide for admission of advocates of retired officers and also Munsiffs with good reputation and who have exercised pl. Class Magistrate powers for not less than 5 years. Considering a report a precedent should with Munsiffs; never the less the benefits of the rules cannot be extended to them as they should never exercise Magisterial powers. It may, however, that the better class of officers may tried when rules become rendered long & fruitful service to the State for more than ¼ century I think these admissions

Note—Contn. sheet

MGCPB—50,000—24-7-05

Serial No.

[illegible] 2nd Clause of Section 16 of the Bombay Land Revenue Code is materially detrimental to the quality of the land. That certain [illegible] should not be granted for a period of more than 5 years and also [illegible] a fixed character. With these additions to the powers under Section 16 I suggest that the proposed [illegible] be passed.

13/2/06

14.3.1906 Dewan 14.3.06

11888/15/2/06

11908

34 Second Class to the I Collector

With Amendments in the Note

1st Grade Secretary

To 1st Collector 16.III.06

11611/19.3.1906

15-3-1906

35- A Memorandum of Land Revenue Rules

NOTE—Contn. sheet

[G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 140 of 1905/506

Serial No.

in an all round Judicial man. There is therefore every justification for his being recalled on his retirement as a member of the Bar. I am afraid it was a mistake to have a District Court Judge at Clonmel as the business of the Court (if in addition he was at one time a Civil Judge there would be no objection) does not add to the mistake by enabling the Judge of admiralty to retire, as Kildare also have never been Civil Judges. Every legal practitioner be he an Advocate or a 1st Grade Pleader or a 2nd Grade Pleader, must possess a good knowledge of Civil Law as his practice will ordinarily be more largely in Civil Courts than in Criminal. To such knowledge add the of our returned Kildare

(1) This, I gather from his note of 12/XI/05, is also the Devonis opinion.

(2) [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-04.

Serial No.

can pretend unless he has besides having exercised magisterial powers also passed an examination in Civil Law. In contested matters being permitted to appear before any magistrate in Criminal cases & can see no objection. This can be done by a circular order of the Chief Court and no alteration of the Rules is called for. Appearance in Criminal cases is not limited to Enrolled Advocates & Leaders. Others who may be permitted to appear if respectable and unexceptionable. There is at present no dearth of fully qualified men for admission to the Bar. In fact the complaint every where is that the Bar is overstocked. That being so, it is most undesirable

MGCPB—20,000—1-11-04.

Serial No.

that the evil should be aggravated by opening the door to unqualified & superannuated retired officials on the ground merely of their having done good service in their time. It is all very well to say that the latter have deserved well of Govt. but at the same time the interests of the tax payer public cannot be relegated to the back ground. It is true that a party is free to make his own choice, but as a rule it is too much to expect him to exercise his choice with discrimination and to his best advantage". On the whole I have no hesitation in recording my humble opinion that the change proposed is a most retrograde one which should not be sanctioned

NOTE—Contn. sheet

12062 21.3.06 20/3/1906

MGCPB—50,000—17-2-05

20/3/06

Revision of rules relating to Pleaders and Advocates.

o

35. A Munsiff of some standing is an all round Judicial man. There is therefore every justification for his being enrolled after his retirement as a member of the Bar. I am afraid it was a mistake to have admitted a mere 1st Class Magistrate to the benefit of such enrolment. (If in additiom he was at one time a Civil Judge, there would be no objection). I would not add to the mistake by extending the privilege of ad-mission to retired Amildars who have never been Civil Judges. Every legal practioner, be he an Advocate or a 1st Grade Pleader or a 2nd Grade Pleader, must possess a good knowledge of Civil Law as his practice will ordinarily be more largely in Civil Courts than in Criminal. To such knowledge, not one of our retired Amildars can pretend unless he has, besides having ex-ercised Magisterial Powers, also passed an examination in Civil Law. To our retired Amildars being permitted to appear before our Magistrates in Criminal cases, I can see no objection. This can be done by a circular order of the Chief Court, and no alteration of the rules is called for. Appearance in Criminal cases, is not limited to enrolled Advocates and Pleaders. Other persons too may be permitted to appear if respectable and unexcept-ionable. There is in these days no dearth of fully qualified men for admission to the Bar. In fact the complaint every where is that the Bar is overstocked. That being so, it is most un-desirable that the evil should be aggravated by opening the door to unqualified and superannuated retired officials on the ground merely of their having done good service in their time. It is all very well to say that the latter have deserved well of Govt., but at the same time the interests of the litigant public should not be relegated to the back ground. It is true

× This I gather from his note of 12.11.05 is also the Dewan's opinion.

true that a party is free to make his own choice, but as a rule it is too much to expect him to exercise this choice with dis-crimination and to his best advantage. On the whole, I have no hesitation in recording my humble opinion that the change pro-posed is a most retrograde one which should not be sanctioned.

Intld. C.S.

26-3-1906.

Submitted to His Highness.

36 The accompanying file deals with the question whether the existing rules regarding the admission of Pleaders and Advocates require any modification.

37 2. The question which started the discussion is whether retired Amildars could be permitted to enrol themselves as Pleaders and incidentally it was doubted whether persons who had been only First Class Magistrates for the requisite period were now rightly admitted as Pleaders.

38. 3. A knowledge of the Civil laws which are far more extensive and intricate than the criminal, is a sina qua non for a Pleader. Neither retired Amildars nor First class Magistrates only acquire such a knowledge in the exercise of their ordinary duties.

39 4. The Chief Court, on being consulted, were of opinion that a new provision giving them free discretion to enrol any person as Pleader might be introduced.

23

40
5. Against this course there seem to be several strong objections. In the first place, it is not what is intended by Section 10 of the Chief Court Regulation which requires that qualifications regarding the admission of Pleaders &c must be defined beforehand. In the second place, such a wide discretion as the one proposed would practically render the Pleaders' Examination more or less a farce. I agree with the First Councillor in thinking that the proposed measure is retrogade in its character.

D

41
6. On a re-consideration of the matter, I am of the opinion that the rules may be left as they are, a view which the First Councillor supports with strong reasons. This may be graciously sanctioned.

26.11.06

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

26.3.06
795 Revision of the rules for the enrolment of Advocates and Pleaders.

792 42. *Order.*

Agree.

K R W
28/3/06

43 Put up again
29.III.06

Give the draft
30/3/1906

B Rice
28/3/06

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

cb File No. 140 of 1905-6.

Serial No.	
6	No. J. 2724 d 4.4.06 to the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore. States that the rules now in force re the enrolment of Advocates and Pleaders cannot be altered so as to render the retired Amildars eligible for enrolment as Advocates or Pleaders.
7	L Mr R. Lutchman Rao & another, Retired Amildars, Mysore. Endorsement no: J 2725 d 4.4.06 Courts 140-7. States that their request cannot be complied with.

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

F. No. 140
S. No: 1 1905-06

No: J 1043

Name of Petitioners: R. Lakshmanrao and another, retired Amildars, Mysore

Village

Taluk: Mysore

District

Date of Arzi: 2nd November 05

Date of Receipt: 4. 11. 05

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

Request that the rules may be amended so as to admit of 2 classes of advocates as in the case of pleaders to enable the retired amildars like themselves to take advantage of the same and if this is not feasible, they may be permitted to be enrolled as first grade pleaders

G.R.S. 26] 1043

File No. 140

Serial No 2

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

No. J 1399

01 18/20 - 11-05 Encl

General and Rev. Secretariat
(Courts)
, *the* 190 .

To

The Registrar of the Chief Ct
of Mysore

Sir,

Date of issue 20-11-05

Signed by The Secretary

(*To be kindly returned when done with.*)

I am directed to forward the accompanying petition No. J 1043 of the 2nd November 1905 from Mr. Lutchuman Rao and another, retired Amildars residing in Mysore, praying for an amendment of the existing rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders, ~~published with Notification No. 8 dated 6th March 1893~~, so as to admit of 2 classes of Advocates, as in the case of Pleaders, to enable retired Amildars like themselves to take advantage of the same, and if this is not feasible for their being allowed to be enrolled

over.

SUBJECT.

as first grade pleaders.

2. I am to request that the Government may be favoured with the views of the Chief Court on the prayer of the petitioners. The whole subject of the admission of retired magistrates, Munsiffs and other officers as legal practitioners may, it is suggested, be advantageously considered in this connection, with a view to seeing whether the rule requires any modification in the interests of such retired officers.

I have &c

16-11-1905

Secretary

List of enclosures,

Copied by 18/11/05

Examined by 18/11/05

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04.

No 4722/180 A & 140 of 05. Bo 4 of 1902.
& No. 3

Bangalore 21st December 1905.

From

The Deputy Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 1399/A & 140-2 dated 18th November 1905 requesting the views of the Chief Court on the petition of Mr. R. Lakshmana Rao and another (retired Amildars) praying for an amendment of the rules relating to advocates and pleaders so as to render them eligible for emolument as legal practitioners and also suggesting that the Chief Court may consider the whole subject of the admission of retired magistrates, Munsiffs and other Officers with a view to ascertain

ascertain whether the rules require any modification in the interests of such retired officers, I am directed to state that the present rule on the subject is clause (c) of Rule 1 of the Rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders. Under it an Amildar who has exercised the powers of a Magistrate of the 1st class for a period of not less than five years would be qualified for admission as an advocate. Amildars are not usually invested with 1st class powers but the Chief Court considers that the standard for advocates should not be lowered and no alteration is therefore called for in the above rule.

2. With regard to admission of retired Officers of Government to pleaderships it is extremely difficult to lay down any general rule for their qualifications outside those prescribed at present for

1st

1st and 2nd grade pleaders. The Judges consider it better that a separate application shewing the character, qualifications and services of each Officer desiring to be enrolled as pleader should be made in each case.

3. The following amendments in the rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders are proposed:—

(i) Add the following to Rule II at the end of clause (e):—

" (f). Any retired Officer of the Government of Mysore whose character, qualifications and services shew him, in the opinion of the Chief Court, to be a proper person for enrolment as a 1st grade pleader."

(ii) Add the following to Rule III at the end of clause (c):

" (d) Any retired Officer of Government of Mysore, whose character, qualifications,

and

and Services shew him, in the opinion of the Chief Court, to be a proper person for enrolment as a 2nd grade pleader.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

O. Baravaradaya

Deputy Registrar.

hdt.

8

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 140

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to 91802

No. 91908
cts 140-05-4

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190 .

To
The Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore

Date of issue 10th Jan 06.

Signed by By Secretary

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. J. 1399 of the 18th Nov 1905 and with reference to your letter No. 4722/80 of the 21st Dec. 1905 regarding the admission of retired officers as legal practitioners, I am directed to ~~state~~ ask you to consider ~~that~~ as regards the ~~question~~ admission of first-class Magistrates ~~under the rules as they stand now. It is a matter for consideration how far they can be considered~~ as Advocates eligible. The case is different from that of Munsiffs, who

over.

P. Substitute I request the Chief Court's
10-1-06

Seen 12/1/06

SUBJECT.

~~there~~ they

~~latter~~ claim by themselves and

~~who~~, having been Civil Justs,

may without difficulty be

recognized as fit to become

Advocates. But the case seems different as

regards First class Magistrates.

~~The Govt. have to be glad to~~

~~have the opinion of the Chief~~

~~Court on the above remark~~

Neve EC

8.1.1906

8-1-06

Lee J

List of enclosures.

Copied by 9/1/06.

Examined by

10

Fair draft

No:3 1908/Cr.140-05-11

To

The Registrar of the Chief Co
Court of Mysore.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.J.1399 dated the 18th November 1905, and with reference to your letter No.4722/180 dated the 21st December 1905, regarding the admission of retired officers as legal practitioners, I am directed to request the Chief Court ~~you~~ to consider how far First Class Magistrates can be deemed eligible for admission as Advocates. As regards Munsiff's they stand by themselves, and having been Civil Judges may without difficulty be recognized as fit to become Advocates. But the case seems different as regards First Class Magistrates.

I have &

(Sd/) B.K.V
8-1-1906.

Secy.

11

2104

N 5526/214

Bangalore 9th February 1906

Dr. no: 140
S. no: 5

From,

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
General and Revenue Dept.

...Court
III
Rule
10-2-06

With reference to your letter No 1908 dated
CFS 140-05-4
10th ultimo requesting the opinion of the Chief Court
as to how far retired first class Magistrates
can be deemed eligible for admission as Ad-
-vocates, I am directed to invite your attention
to letter No 500/E dated 29th July 1891 from the
Chief Judge and President of the Board of E.
S. and Pleaders Examinations to the Devan
and to state that in the opinion of the Chief
Court the experience of retired 1st class Magis-
trates especially qualifies them to act as
Advocates in Criminal cases. Unless they
make themselves efficient in the conduct of
Civil cases, it is not likely that Litigants

would

criminal rule in
Criminal Rules
of Practice

H. V.

will employ them in that clafs of cases and therefore there is no reason to restrain them from such employment by any special order.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

D. Cayatatruchup

Registrar.

Cay

G.R.S. 26]

\13

File No. 140

Serial No 6

Diary No. of letter replied to J 2104 1906

No. J 2724

General and Rev. Secretaria

(Courts)

, *the* , 190

To

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Egne.

Date of issue 6.4.06

Signed by The Dy Secretary

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending in your letter No. 5516/214 of the 5th Feb 06, in regard to the prayer of certain retired students for an amendment of the rules relating to Pleaders and Pleaders so as to render the former eligible for enrolment as legal practitioners, I am directed to state that, after giving the matter their best consideration, the Govt. are of opinion that the

over.

SUBJECT.

Rules may remain as they are at present and that no alterations need be made therein

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your obedient servant

[illegible]

3/3/06

RCS
2/3/06

List of enclosures,

Copied by [illegible] 2/4/06

Examined by CN

2/4/06

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04.

No. J 27725
Cl 740 - 9/

MYSORE GOVT. GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT,
Dated, Bangalore, 4 - 4 1906

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Mr. R. Lutchman & ...
Rao, and another, retired Amildars residing in Mysore

in reply to their Petition Registered No. J 1043 dated the 2nd November 1905, praying for an amendment of the existing rules relating to Advocates and Pleaders, so as to admit of 2 classes of Advocates, as in the case of Pleaders, to enable retired Amildars like themselves to take advantage of the same, as far as this is not feasible, for their being allowed to be enrolled as first grade pleaders.

The Petitioners are informed that their request cannot be complied with.

Cl
8/3/06

By Order,

4/3/06

Secretary.

Copied 6/4/06.
Examined 6/4/06

6/4/06